UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,243	03/29/2004	Samhita Dasgupta	140322	2205
••••	7590 . 04/20/200 ECTRIC COMPANY	EXAMINER		
GLOBAL RESEARCH PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59 NISKAYUNA, NY 12309			JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	
		1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
3 MONTHS 04/20/2007 PA		PER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/812,243	DASGUPTA			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jaworski Francis J.	3768			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versiller to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE!	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2a)    This action is <b>FINAL</b> .    2b)    This 3)    Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)	wn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the drawing(s) is objected to by the Edrawing(s) is objected to by the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/812,243

Art Unit: 3768

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The finality of the previous Office action has been WITHDRAWN according to telephone notice given earlier to the applicant's attorney because additional art had been uncovered during the search update for issue processing.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engeler et al (US5566133, of record) in view of either Sumino (JP56-157879) or Aratama (JP61-296266), alone or further in view of Bartelt et al of record (only this latter argument extending to claims 5 and 6 as below).

Application/Control Number: 10/812,243

Art Unit: 3768

The former is representative of structure and method for optoelectronic modulation by laser light source 22 using a prior digitization of the received ultrasound signal for an array of ultrasound elements. It would have been obvious in view of either of the latter to directly electro-optically modulate (Sumino 5,9 or Aratama 28) (and also optoelectronically demodulate with respect to signals in analog form (Sumino 10 or Aratama 32)) for a severality of elements since this directly preserves the information waveshape of the pulse information for each element. Pre-amplification is practiced as necessary per element 62.

In the alternative, Bartelt et al (EP 0762142, of record) teaches that in using an optical transmission stage one may multiplex /demultiplex for optical transmission where small fiber-optic cable diameter is desirable, in consideration of the fact that in Engeler et al per se is ambivalent since that system is offered to mitigate beyond the limits of multiplexer power dissipation ceiling in the probe head.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Yakymyshyn et al (US5396362).

Whereas the former are silent as to polymer optoelectronic component constituency, it would have been obvious in view of the latter col. 1 lines 27 – 34 considered together with col. 6 lines 54 – 65 to fabricate the optoelectronic components

Art Unit: 3768

using a polymer film in order to provide a suitable refractive index for operation of the device.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sliwa jr et al as the latter was applied in the Grp I rejection of portion I of the prior Office action May 1, 2006.

This action is NOT made final however the case should be prepared for final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

04092007

Francis J. čaworski Primary Examiner